

1 J. Noah Hagey, Esq. (SBN: 262331)
2 hagey@braunhagey.com

3 BRAUNHAGEY & BORDEN LLP
4 351 California Street, 10th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94104
6 Telephone: (415) 599-0210
7 Facsimile: (415) 276-1808

8 Mitchell C. Stein, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
9 stein@braunhagey.com

10 Kirsten Jackson, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
11 dooley@braunhagey.com

12 BRAUNHAGEY & BORDEN LLP
13 118 W. 22nd Street, 12th Floor
14 New York, NY 10011
15 Telephone: (646) 829-9403
16 Facsimile: (646) 403-4089

17 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
18 TARI LABS, LLC

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 TARI LABS, LLC,
17 Plaintiff,
18 v.
19 LIGHTNING LABS, INC.,
20 Defendant.

Case No. 3:22-cv-07789-WHO

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF TARI LABS, LLC'S EX
PARTE APPLICATION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Date: March 15, 2023, or as the
Court may otherwise order
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick
Courtroom: _____

1 Having reviewed and fully considered the *ex parte* motion for temporary restraining order
 2 filed by Plaintiff Tari Labs, LLC's ("Plaintiff") pursuant to L.R. 7-11 and 65-1(a), the
 3 accompanying memorandum of points and authorities, declarations and attached exhibits, and
 4 complaint on file in this action, and based on the facts and representations therein, the Court finds
 5 that:

6 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and parties in this action.

7 2. Plaintiff is the registered owner of United States Trademark Registration No.
 8 6,701,730 for TARI®. Tari uses the TARI® mark to market products and services including the
 9 Tari blockchain protocol.

10 3. Defendant Lightning Labs Inc. ("Defendant") is marketing and intends to release a
 11 competing blockchain protocol under the mark "TARO."

12 4. Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits of its trademark infringement claims.
 13 First, Plaintiff owns valid, protectable interests in its registered trademark TARI®. Second, the
 14 Court finds that Defendant's use of "TARO" to sell competing products and services is highly
 15 likely to confuse consumers. *See Pom Wonderful LLC v. Hubbard*, 775 F.3d 1118, 1124 (9th Cir.
 16 2014).

17 5. Plaintiff is entitled to a presumption of irreparable harm as a matter of law based on
 18 its likelihood of success on the merits. 15 U.S.C. § 1116. Plaintiff also has shown that it lacks an
 19 adequate remedy at law based on the loss of control over its business reputation and damage loss of
 20 goodwill threatened by Defendant's continued infringement. *See Century 21 Real Est. Corp. v.*
 21 *Sandlin*, 846 F.2d 1175, 1180 (9th Cir. 1988).

22 6. The equities tip decidedly in favor of granting an injunction because Plaintiff has
 23 shown irreparable harm, while Defendant "cannot complain of the harm that will befall [it] when
 24 properly forced to desist from [its] infringing activities." *Triad Systems Corp. v. Southeastern Exp.*
 25 *Co.*, 64 F.3d 1330, 1338 (9th Cir. 1995).

26 7. The public interest will be served by an injunction because "[t]he public has an
 27 interest in avoiding confusion between two companies' products." *Internet Specialties W., Inc. v.*
 28 *Milon-DiGiorgio Enterprises, Inc.*, 559 F.3d 985, 993 (9th Cir. 2009)

1 8. Plaintiff is not required to post security under Fed R. Civ. P. 65(c) due to its
2 likelihood of success on the merits. *See 2Die4Kourt v. Hillair Capital Mgmt., LLC*, 692 F. App'x
3 366, 369 (9th Cir. 2017).

4 9. Defendant has been served with notice of Plaintiff's motion via ECF.

5 **THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** Defendant and its officers, directors,
6 employees, agents, subsidiaries, and distributors are immediately restrained and enjoined, until
7 such time as the Court rules upon Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction:

8 1. From selling, advertising, promoting, offering for sale, or making available for use
9 by any party any product or service related to blockchain technology, cryptocurrency, or digital
10 assets using the mark "TARO."

11 2. From knowingly instructing, aiding, abetting, or acquiescing in any other person or
12 business entity's infringement as described in Paragraph 1 above.

13 3. To the extent Defendant has previously disseminated products, services, advertising,
14 displays, media images, or other publicly available or viewable materials that are not in compliance
15 with Paragraph 1 prior to February 21, 2023, Defendant need not remove or recall such materials
16 until such time as the Court rules upon Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.

17 This temporary restraining order shall expire once the Court rules upon Plaintiff's motion
18 for a preliminary injunction according to the schedule set forth below.

19 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT** Defendant shall appear before the Honorable
20 William H. Orrick, United States District Judge, in Courtroom 2 of the United States District Court,
21 Northern District of California, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, on
22 March 15, 2023 and show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue during the pendency
23 of this action as follows:

24 1. Enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, employees, agents, subsidiaries, and
25 distributors from selling, advertising, promoting, offering for sale, or making available for use by
26 any party any product or service related to blockchain technology, cryptocurrency, or digital assets
27 using the mark "TARO."

1 2. Enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, employees, agents, subsidiaries, and
2 distributors from knowingly instructing, aiding, abetting, or acquiescing in any other person or
3 business entity's infringement as described in Paragraph 1 above.

4 3. Allowing Defendant seven (7) days from the entry of such preliminary injunction to
5 remove from commerce any existing products, services, advertising, displays, media images, or
6 other publicly available or viewable materials that are not in compliance with Paragraph 1 (the
7 "Compliance Period"). At the conclusion of the Compliance Period, Defendant shall securely store
8 in a non-public facility, or destroy, any remaining products or articles covered by Paragraph 1, and
9 shall certify its compliance with the terms of the preliminary injunction to Plaintiff in writing.

10 In addition to service via ECF, Plaintiff shall serve this Order to Show Cause and
11 supporting papers upon Defendant by _____. Any response or opposition to this Order to Show
12 Cause shall be filed fourteen (14) days before the hearing, and any reply by Plaintiff shall be filed
13 seven (7) days before the hearing.

14
15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 Dated: _____, 2023

Honorable William H. Orrick
United States District Judge